Reply to Office Action of March 02, 2011

Docket No.: 1561-0140PUS1 Art Unit: 1733

Page 6 of 10

# **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

One Sheet of Replacement Drawings is attached at the end of this paper in order to eliminate the Chinese characters from FIGS. 1 and 2.

No new matter has been added.

Docket No.: 1561-0140PUS1

Art Unit: 1733

Page 7 of 10

### **REMARKS**

Claim 8 has been cancelled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Claims 1-7 and 9 are pending in the present application. Claims 3-7 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1 and 3 are independent

### Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has required restriction between Group I, claim 1 and 2, drawn to a method, and Group II, claim 3-9, drawn to a device.

Applicants elect with traverse, Group II, claims 3-7 and 9.

### **Traversal**

As set forth in Section 803 of the MPEP, the Examiner must examine an application on the merits if the examination of the entire application can be made without serious burden. Two criteria are identified for a proper requirement for restriction:

- 1. The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- 2. There must be a serious burden on the Examiner if the restriction is not required.

The Applicant respectfully submits that a serious burden has not been placed on the Examiner to consider all of the claims in a single application.

In order to be responsive to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement, claims 3-7, and 9 have been initially elected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Restriction Requirement and act on all of the claims in the present application. If the Examiner does persist in the restriction requirement, the right to file a divisional application directed to the non-elected claim at a later date, if desired, is reserved.

#### Amendments to the Specification

The Title has been amended in order to better reflect the subject matter of the claimed invention. No new matter has been added.

Docket No.: 1561-0140PUS1 Art Unit: 1733

Page 8 of 10

Arguments Regarding Independent Claim 3

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to

advance prosecution of the present application, independent claim 3 has been rewritten in

independent form to recite a combination of elements directed to a device for implementing a high

efficiency method scooping-up slag from liquid iron, including inter alia:

"two gears (11) are fixed to rear ends of two slag rakes (1) by means of two rotating

shafts (3), and

wherein the two slag rakes (1) are adapted to swing toward each other in order to clamp

and scoop-up the slag."

As mentioned in the Background of the Invention (page 1 of the specification) the

conventional "slag rake, which is made of refractory material, is mounted on a cantilever of the

machine. By immersing the rake into the liquid iron to a certain depth and making it moving

along the surface of liquid iron in linear or curved reciprocating manner, it can rake out the solid

slag floating on the surface of liquid iron in the ladle gradually."

"However, the conventional slagging-off technique and the equipment have

disadvantages as follows: (1) Long time taking for the work of slagging-off and low working

efficiency. Normally, it would need to reciprocate for over ten or even tens of times, which takes

5 to 10 minutes; (2) Incomplete deslagging and low deslagging rate."

On the other hand, the Disclosure of the Invention (page 2 of the specification), discloses

the following: "The two wings of slag rake mounted to the front end of cantilever makes swing

movement respectively along the surface of liquid iron. When gradually moving close to each

other, they get put together and clamp the solid slag. Then, driven by the cantilever, the two slag

rakes move back to the vicinity of the edge of the liquid iron ladle and discharge the slag."

"Comparing the existing slagging-off technology and equipment, the present invention

has the following advantages: (1) The deslagging rate increased obviously. If the slag amount is

not much, just one swing motion of the two slag rakes will rake out over 90% of the slag. And if

Docket No.: 1561-0140PUS1

Art Unit: 1733 Page 9 of 10

the slag amount is much, over 90% of slag can be raked out after two or three swing motions; (2)

The speed for the process of slagging-off increased greatly. It just takes less than 3 minutes for

the whole process of slagging-off."

In view of the novel combination of elements set forth in independent claim 3, as

amended herein, the present invention defines over the known conventional devices.

Claim for Priority

The Examiner has not recognized the Applicant's claim for foreign priority. The Examiner

is respectfully requested to acknowledge Applicant's claim for priority in the next office action.

Amendments to the Drawings

One Sheet of Replacement Drawings is attached at the end of this paper in order to

eliminate the Chinese characters from FIGS. 1 and 2.

No new matter has been added.

Acknowledgement of Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the Information Disclosure

Statement filed on June 14, 2006. An initialed copy of the SB/08 should be sent to the undersigned

at the earliest convenience of the Examiner.

Docket No.: 1561-0140PUS1

Art Unit: 1733 Page 10 of 10

## **CONCLUSION**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Carl T. Thomsen Reg. No. 50,786, at 703-208-4030 (direct line) to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

- $\square$ Attached is a Petition for Extension of Time.
- $\sqrt{\phantom{a}}$ Attached hereto is the fee transmittal listing the required fees.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: June 2, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Slattery

Registration No. 28,380

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100E

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/jam

Attachments: One sheet of Replacement Drawings

Fee Transmittal

Petition for Extension of Time